REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the comments set forth fully below. Claims 1-7, 9-33 and 35-41 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-7, 9-33 and 35-41 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 9, 14, 21, 28, 33, and 37 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-7, 9-33 and 35-41 are now pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-7, 9-33 and 35-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0173981 to Stewart (hereinafter "Stewart") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0002343 to Brauel et al. (hereinafter "Brauel"). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Stewart teaches a system and method for enabling a business to register a domain location to provide location based services to on-site customers. [Stewart, Abstract]. Specifically, Stewart teaches a domain place registry 150 where physical domain name information is stored and a domain place registration web site 190 which a business 160 accesses to register a domain location and to specify desirable known geographic location ("KGL") services to be available at the location. [Stewart, ¶ 0008]. The known geographic location (KGL) services or localized information is obtained by the system through the specification of the localized information <u>by businesses</u> on the domain place registry. [Stewart, ¶ 0036]. In other words, Stewart teaches that localized information regarding any one location is obtained from and specified by the businesses that register on the domain place registry. Specifically, Stewart teaches a Domain Place Registration (DPR) server 150 that stores a data structure including information regarding domain place registration information of the specific business doing the registration, identification information of the business, and KGL services information specified by the

business. [Stewart, ¶¶ 0037, 0047, 0048, 0054] As a result, Stewart teaches that a business can register a domain and specify localized information so as to provide location based services to on-site customers, not that the localized information is defined by the system.

Within the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it is stated that the localized information of Stewart is provided by the businesses. In other words, the localized information of Stewart is not defined and provided by the system maintaining the internet site/portal. By the above amendments, the claim limitations are amended to specify that the localized information is defined by the apparatus/internet site/internet server/internet portal according to the physical location of a specific access point, independent of an identification of the specific access point. Stewart does not teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point.

Furthermore, Stewart does not teach a method of generating a location table corresponding to the network address and location of access points for an initial communication from each of the access points. Stewart teaches that access points "may store [their] KGL information and may transmit the [access point's] KGL to the system." [Stewart, ¶ 0065] (emphasis added). Stewart does not teach that access points transmit network address and location information upon the initial communication from each access point. Specifically, Stewart teaches that the access points may be used to store their KGL information and then to transmit that information any time they communicate with the registry. [Stewart, ¶ 0065]. Stewart does not teach creating a new entry in a location table containing the access point's network address and location only upon the initial communication and thereby not needing the access point to transmit the information again on subsequent communications.

Within the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it is stated that the previously claimed "first communication" does not clearly claim generating an entry in the location table "before any communication from the access point." (Office Action, Page 6). By

the above amendments, the claim limitation directed to generating a location table entry is amended to replace "a first communication" with "an initial communication", such as to clarify that an entry is generated in the location table upon receiving an initial communication from an access point. As described above, Stewart does not teach a method of generating a location table corresponding to the network address and location of access points for an initial communication from each of the access points. Brauel is not cited as teaching this limitation.

Brauel teaches a communications network including a communication server 102 coupled to a plurality of access points 106. Brauel teaches that the plurality of access points 106 are capable of wireless communications with one or more mobile wireless communication devices 120. [Brauel, ¶ 0021] Brauel teaches that the wireless communication devices 120 determine their own location based on information provided by the communication server 102. [Brauel, ¶ 0025]

Within the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it is stated that Brauel is cited specifically "to make up for the deficiency of the location table including a plurality of entries having a network address corresponding to one or the access points in Fig. 2 and paragraph 11 of Brauel." Brauel does not teach that the location information is determined at an internet portal based on the location table, or that a controller within an apparatus providing an internet site determines the location information based on the location table. Nor does Brauel teach providing localized information obtained from a localized information database.

Each of the Applicant's independent claims teach either that the localized information corresponding to the location information is defined by the internet portal, independent of an identification of the access point, or generating an entry in the location table upon receiving an initial communication from an access point. As a result, as described above, because neither Stewart and Brauel teach defining the localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information is determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point, or generating an entry in a location table

upon receiving an initial communication from an access point, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach the claims of the present invention.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of providing localized information to a user accessing an internet site through an access point. The method of Claim 1 comprises determining a network address corresponding to the access point, obtaining location information corresponding to the network address from a location table, wherein the location information is determined at an internet portal based on the location table, obtaining the localized information from a localized information database using the location information, wherein the localized information corresponding to the location information is defined by the internet portal, independent of an identification of the access point, and providing the localized information to the user through the access point. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 2-7 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-7 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 9 is directed to a method of generating a location table corresponding to locations of access points. The method of Claim 9 comprises obtaining a network address of one of the access points upon receiving an initial communication from one of the access points, obtaining location information corresponding to a physical location of one of the access points, wherein the physical location is determined at an internet portal, generating an entry within the location table including the network address and the location information and repeating the above for an initial communication from each of the access points. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach a method of generating an entry in a

location table upon receiving an initial communication from an access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 9 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 10-13 are dependent on the independent Claim 9. As described above, the independent Claim 9 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 10-13 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 14 is directed to an apparatus to provide an internet site and capable of being accessed through an access point. The apparatus of Claim 14 comprises a location table including a plurality of entries each having a network address and location information corresponding to the access point, a localized information database coupled to the location table to provide localized information based on the location information, and a controller coupled to the location table and the localized information database for determining the location information of a specific access point based on the location table and for determining the localized information corresponding to the location information of the specific access point, the localized information determined independent of an identification of the specific access point. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 15-20 are all dependent on the independent Claim 14. As described above, the independent Claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 15-20 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 21 is directed to an apparatus for providing an internet site and capable of being accessed through an access point. The apparatus of Claim 21 comprises a first means for maintaining a location table including a plurality of entries, each entry having a

network address and location information corresponding to a specific access point, a second means for maintaining a localized information database coupled to the first means for maintaining and for providing localized information based on the location information, and a controlling means coupled to the location table and the localized information database for determining the location information of a specific access point based on the location table and for determining the localized information corresponding to the location information of the specific access point, the localized information determined independent of an identification of the specific access point. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 21 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 22-27 are all dependent on the independent Claim 21. As described above, the independent Claim 21 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 22-27 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 28 is directed to an internet server for providing localized information from a localized information database to users through an access point. The internet site of Claim 28 comprises a location table maintained by the internet site comprising a plurality of entries, each entry including a network address corresponding to the access point, and location information corresponding to the access point, and a controller associated with the internet site for determining location information based on the location table, wherein localized information corresponding to location information of a specific access point accessing the internet site is defined by the internet server according to the location information, independent of an identification of the specific access point. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of

an identification of the access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 28 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 29-32 are dependent on the independent Claim 28. As described above, the independent Claim 28 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 29-32 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 33 is directed to a network of devices. The network of Claim 33 comprises one or more access points to provide access to an internet site, one or more internet access systems, each capable of communicating with the one or more access points to access the internet site through one of the access points, an apparatus to provide the internet site and capable of being accessed through the one or more access points comprising a location table including a plurality of entries each having a network address and physical location information corresponding to an appropriate one of the access points, and a localized information database coupled to the location table to provide localized information based on the physical location information, wherein localized information corresponding to a physical location of a specific access point accessing the internet site is defined by the apparatus according to the physical location, independent of an identification of the specific access point, wherein the physical location information is determined at the apparatus based on the location table. As described above, neither Stewart, Brauel nor their combination teach defining localized information by the internet server/portal, the localized information being determined according to the physical location information and independent of an identification of the access point. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination.

Claims 35-41 are all dependent on the independent Claim 33. As described above, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Stewart, Brauel and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 35-41 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: March 13, 2009   By: /Jonathan O. Owens/
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902
Attorneys for Applicant(s)